

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

At the outset, the Applicant appreciates the thorough review and consideration of the subject application. The Final Office Action of November 16, 2007, has been received and its contents carefully noted.

REJECTION OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,188,158 by Stanton et al. ("Stanton"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections in light of the following remarks.

MPEP §2131 provides:

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegall Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir.1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The Applicant reiterates that Stanton fails to disclose each and every aspect of the claimed invention. Claim 1 recites, "a software bus ... configured to provide common access to each of the plurality of services wherein the software bus and the presentation framework operate independent from each other; and a plurality of extensible modules ... wherein each extensible module ... has independent access to each of the plurality of services via the software bus."

In the response to the last Amendment, the current rejection cites the existence of a LAN architecture of Column 6, lines 16-26 of Stanton as presumably disclosing a software bus and a presentation framework that operate independent of each other. This portion of Stanton states, "An enterprise component may be thought of as any piece of software that is specified, constructed and deployed as a discrete unit. It is a unit of composition for larger scale components and may itself comprise other components. A component offers a set of services to its consumers and itself may rely on another set of services. It may be distributed in nature and may execute over one or more processes in a heterogeneous computing environment. The messaging platform enables the sharing of enterprise component services existing within the enterprise as well as those existing in other, networked enterprise systems."

This text of Stanton describes general definitions of enterprise components. Indeed these definitions could apply to many networks. Lacking in this quoted section is a disclosure reflecting independence between a software bus coupled to a plurality of services and a presentation bus. Instead this section of Stanton points out that one component offering services "may rely on another set of services." This section of Stanton, and indeed Stanton as a whole, fails to disclose the claimed independence recited in claim 1 of the present application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 further recites that each extensible module has independent access to each of the plurality of services via the software bus. The rejection of claim 1 cites Stanton at Column 1, lines 32-40 for this particular aspect of the invention. Stanton states, "The evolution of extended enterprises and virtual enterprises precludes a reliance on homogenous environments and

proprietary Application Program Interfaces (APIs). Companies have to absorb an array of differing hardware and software solutions while maintaining open integration avenues. B2B applications require infrastructure that is capable of transacting against a diverse set of software and hardware and through different integration technologies.” The current rejection argues that this portion of Stanton describes an “open network” and alludes that such an open network explicitly or inherently discloses the claimed invention. The Applicant disagrees with this conclusion.

The above cited portion of Stanton again lacks any disclosure of extensible modules having independent access to a plurality of services via a software bus. The recited text identifies a need in the art that the present invention addresses but it does not offer a solution, and certainly not the solution claimed by the Applicant. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

For the aforementioned reasons, the Applicant deems that claim 1 is novel over Stanton. As claims 2-14 depend from claim 1 and do not restrict the limitations set forth in claim 1, they too are novel over Stanton. Furthermore, and for at least the same reasons, the rejection of claim 15 as being unpatentable over Stanton in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,606,744 by Mikurak (“Mikurak”) is moot as Mikurak fails to resolve any of the deficiencies noted in Stanton.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submits that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this

Serial No. 09/987,760

Reply to Final Office Action of November 16, 2007

response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution. Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

No fee is believed due for this submittal. However, any fee deficiency associated with this submittal may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

1/17, 2008



Michael C. Martensen, No. 46,901
Hogan & Hartson LLP
One Tabor Center
1200 17th Street, Suite 1500
Denver, Colorado 80202
(719) 448-5910 Tel
(303) 899-7333 Fax